REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action mailed July 9, 2007, claims 1-24 were rejected under §103 as being unpatentable over Shanthaveeraiah in view of Yao. In the present Response, paragraph 4 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the §103 rejection. Neither reference is directed toward providing a relationship between a port address of a node and the physical slot location of the node (paragraph 5). Thus, neither reference, nor their combination, addresses the difficulty that system administrators have in easily determining to which physical port of a node a particular cable should be connected. The claimed invention addresses, and solves, this problem.

Rather, the primary reference, Shanthaveeraiah, "relates discovery of devices attached to a fabric in a storage network" (col. 1, lines 7-8; col. 5, lines 15-18) and thus does not deal with mapping a physical port location to a port address ("generating an interface_id of the connected port, the interface_id corresponding to a slot number of the target node in which the port is located"). And, the secondary reference, Yao, "is related to ... address forwarding in a computer network" (paragraph 1) and likewise does not deal with mapping a physical port location to a port address.

More specifically, with respect to claim 1, the "nodes' of Shanthaveeraiah are nodes which are created internally within the host (col. 1, lines 49-55). They are not nodes of external devices to which source nodes are to be connected. The passage of Shanthaveeraiah cited in the Office Action, col. 9, lines 49-67, which is said to teach many of the elements of claim 1 refers not to target nodes but merely to a list of devices to which the host is connected. Nor does Shanthaveeraiah disclose the back and forth queries and responses with the name server in which first the port addresses of a target node are received and then, based on those addresses, the corresponding port names are received. Consequently, Shanthaveeraiah and Yao do not render claim 1 obvious.

Similarly, the two references do not render claim 7 obvious. In addition, the passage of Shanthaveeraiah cited in the Office said to teach "a target node with a node name" refers to devices to which the host is connected but there is no reference to a node or a node name. Rather, as noted above, Shanthaveeraiah is directed to discovering devices attached to the host and creating nodes within the host to access the devices. And, with respect to the passage cited as teaching "a selected port in the

target node having a port address and a port name," that passage again refers to a port within the host, not the target node. There is also no suggestion in Shanthaveeraiah that the list referred to in the cited column 9, lines 49-61, includes port addresses or that it is anything but a list of devices. Finally, Shanthaveeraiah fails to disclose the back and forth queries and responses with the name server in which first the port addresses of a target node are received and then, based on those addresses, the corresponding port names are received. Consequently, Shanthaveeraiah and Yao do not render claim 1 obvious.

The forgoing comments also apply to the rejection of claim 21. Additionally, neither Shanthaveeraiah nor Yao teach that a target node name is modified as claimed "to generate the name of each port in the target node." The cited passage of Shanthaveeraiah again merely refers to a list of devices. As before, the nodes referred to in Shanthaveeraiah are in the host, not the devices. Thus, even if a target node name was modified in Shanthaveeraiah, the result would not be a target port name. Moreover, the Office Action has not quoted the complete seventh element in claim 21. As written, it reads: "from a WWNN of a target node and the interface_id of a selected port, generating the name of the selected port" (emphasis added), not "from a name of a target node, generating the name of the selected port" as quoted in the Office Action. Consequently, Shanthaveeraiah and Yao do not render claim 21 obvious.

With respect to the rejection of claims 2, 8 and 16, the Office Action cite paragraph 57 of Yao as teaching the claimed element "from a WWNN of a target node and the interface_id of a selected port, generating the name of the selected port." However, the table described in the passage is not used to determine the physical address of a port and, in fact, the passage does not refer to physical addresses, only IP addresses. And, as noted above, neither reference teaches to query/receiving aspect of the claim. Consequently, Shanthaveeraiah and Yao do not render claims 2, 8 or 16 obvious.

Claims 4, 18 and 22 are also not rendered obvious by the references. While the Office Action asserts that Yao teaches "a system for creating paths ... that includes using the world wide names to map the ports and target addresses to their physical addresses," no specific passage is cited and the undersigned can find no such passage in Yao.

With respect to claims 5, 19 and 23, neither reference teaches or even suggests modifying the target node name or the WWNN in any way, much less the claimed "modifying the target node name … [by] replacing a byte of the world wide node name with a byte indicative of the slot number." Consequently, Shanthaveeraiah and Yao do not render claims 5, 19 or 23 obvious.

With respect to claims 9-14, because the nodes of Shanthaveeraiah are internal to the host, as discussed above, a query is not received from a source node and a port address of the target is not transmitted back. Consequently, Shanthaveeraiah and Yao do not render claims 9-14 obvious.

In addition, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the dependent claims are further allowable based on the allowability of the respective independent claims.

The references made of record but not relied on have been reviewed but are considered to be only of background interest.

For the foregoing reasons, the claims are believed to be allowable, the Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a favorable Office Action is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned by telephone if a conversation would expedite prosecution of this case.

This constitutes a request for any needed extension of time. A one-month extension fee is being submitted with this Response. The undersigned hereby authorizes the charge of any deficiency of fees submitted herewith, or the credit of any overpayment, to deposit account number 09-0449.

Respectfully Submitted,

_____/Dan Shifrin/_____
Dan Shifrin, #34,473
Law Office of Dan Shifrin
14081 West 59th Ave
Arvada, Colorado 80004
303-403-4510
303-785-8795 (Fax)

cc: IBM- Tucson